



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/812,872	03/19/2001	Jared J. Jackson	ARC920010008US1	1256

23334 7590 05/04/2007
FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS, GUTMAN, BONGINI
& BIANCO P.L.
ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER
551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER

NAWAZ, ASAD M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/04/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/812,872	JACKSON, JARED	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Asad M. Nawaz	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the arguments received on January 24, 2007.

Claims 1-22 are pending further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-15 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Lee et al, 6,779,040 (Lee hereafter) further in view of Holtz et al (US patent publication No. 20020053078 A1).

As per claims 3 and 13, Lee teaches a system comprising: at least one networked device (104, fig. 1; col. 4, lines 31-32; client computer is a network device);

and a content server for delivering content information to the at least one networked device (102, fig. 1; col. 4, line 42-46; server provides image content to client devices), the content server including: a first memory for storing at least one of an image delivery parameter and an image presentation parameter associated with a networked device (col. 4, lines 11-15; server stores user device's capabilities and preferences associated with the images stored on the device);

a network interface for communicating with a network link communicatively coupled with the at least one networked device (network interface is an inherent component of a network device);

a controller, communicatively coupled to the first memory and to the network interface (controller is an inherent component of server device);

and a second memory, communicatively coupled to the controller, for storing computer instructions for the controller to control the content server for (also inherent component of server device for processing client requests):

receiving a request for delivery of content information to the at least one networked device, the content information comprising image information (col. 4, lines 18-23; server receives requests from client for image data);

and determining, based on an automatically determined image delivery parameter and an image presentation parameter associated with the at least one networked device, an image format for the image information for delivery of the image information to the at least one networked device and for presentation of the image information at the at least one networked device (col. 4, lines 18-23; upon receiving the image request from a client, the server retrieves the image file and determines the format of the image file according to the client's capabilities or preferences to be delivered to the client);

and providing a response for the request, the response comprising at least a portion of the image information in the image format (col. 4, lines 25-28; server then sends the image response to the client).

However, Lee does not explicitly indicate the request including a session information pertaining to the current communication session between the networked device and a server, the session information being separate from the request for delivery of image information and the image delivery parameter and the image presentation parameter associated with the networked device being contained in the session information.

Holtz et al teaches a session information pertaining to the current communication session between the networked device and a server, the session information being separate from the request for delivery of image information and the image delivery parameter and the image presentation parameter associated with the networked device being contained in the session information (refer to abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Holtz into those of Lee in order to make the system more secure. Keeping information such as session information allows for the parties involved to communicate in a longer session that has been authenticated without the need to repeatedly input repetitive information.

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 9 recite similar limitations as claims 3 and 13 and therefore rejected by similar rationale as those claims.

As per claim 11, Lee discloses a method comprising the steps of: storing an automatically determined image delivery parameter and an image presentation parameter associated with a networked device;

receiving a request for delivery of information to the networked device, the information comprising displayable image information (see claims 3 and 13 rejection);

determining available image formats for the displayable image information (col. 2, lines 35-41; server determines from a plurality of different image formats to send to requesting client);

and selecting one of the available image formats, based at least in part on the automatically determined image delivery parameter and an image presentation parameter, for delivery to and presentation at the networked device (col. 2, lines 35-41; after determining from a plurality of image formats, the server selects a best matching version of the image data based on the user's capabilities and sends the image response to the client).

As per claim 4, Lee teaches couple the response to the network interface, the response being destined for reception by the networked device (col. 4, lines 25-28; server sends response to client device).

As per claims 5-6, Lee teaches the second memory includes computer instruction for the controller to control the server system to: receive, along with the request, the at least one of the image delivery parameter and the image presentation parameter associated with the networked device (col. 4, lines 13-18);

and store the at least one of the image delivery parameter and the image presentation parameter in the first memory (col. 4, lines 13-18; server receives user preferences and capabilities along with the request from the user device; server also stores user preferences and capabilities for future reference);

server receives the request from one of the networked device and another requester device (inherent from disclosed invention; server is capable to receive and process plurality of requests from plurality of clients).

As per claims 8, 10, 12, and 14, Lee teaches the step of providing a response for the request, the response comprising at least a portion of the displayable image information in the image format; and sending the file to a network interface, the file being destined for reception by the networked device (col. 4, lines 25-28; server sends image response to user's device).

As per claim 15, Lee teaches the first memory comprises a first database for storing records containing image delivery parameters and image presentation parameters associated with the at least one networked device (col. 4, lines 13-15), and a second database for storing at least one image record (col. 4, lines 11-13).

As per claim 19, Lee teaches image format is selected from a set of image formats including binary bitmap and vector-based graphics (col. 5, lines 27-30; Cartesian volume is the vector-based graphics of JPEG images).

As per claim 20, Lee teaches image format is selected from a set of image formats including JPEG (col. 4, lines 12).

As per claims 21-22, Lee teaches the image delivery parameter corresponds to POTS (114, fig. 1; col. 4, lines 36-38); image presentation parameter corresponds to Desktop Workstation (104, fig. 1; col. 4, lines 32-33).

4. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Fields et al in view of Salo et al, 6,563,800 (Salo hereafter).

As per claim 16, Lee and Holtz teach the system of claim 13, wherein the controller requests at least the determination, base on at least one of an image delivery parameter and an image presentation parameter associated with the at least one networked device an image format for the image information.

However, Lee and Holtz do not explicitly indicate a controller using Application Programming Interface call to request the determination method. Salo teaches a controller using Application Programming Interface call to request the determination method (see Salo disclosure col. 13, lines 30-37).

However, it is well known and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use API calls between the application program objects and low level interface of the operating system.

As to claim 17, Lee and Holtz teach the system of claim 16 further comprising an image response. However, Lee and Holtz fail to teach the response being to an API call.

Salo teaches a controller using Application Programming Interface call to request the determination method (see Salo disclosure col. 13, lines 30-37).

However, it is well known and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use API calls between the application program objects and low level interface of the operating system.

As to claim 18, Lee and Holtz teach the system of claim 16 further comprising an image proxy engine but does not explicitly indicate the method being in response to an API request.

Salo teaches a controller using Application Programming Interface call to request the determination method (see Salo disclosure col. 13, lines 30-37).

However, it is well known and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use API calls between the application program objects and low level interface of the operating system.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments have been considered and are deemed not to be persuasive. Applicant argues in substance A), There is no motivation to be found in Lee et al or Holtz et al for combining the references B) Holtz is not concerned with current device or network conditions and C), the presently claimed invention determines image delivery parameters and image presentation parameters (session information).

In response to A), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the examiner has relied upon knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In response to B) Holtz et al teaches the collection of metrics and the monitoring of sale and distribution of advertisements within the network. Furthermore, a user can customize transmission such as by choosing live programs (that rely upon **current** network conditions and device capabilities (0026). Even further, client-server metrics are used to measure the quantity of consumers that actually receive an advertisement via the network. Thus Holtz without a doubt meets the emphasized "current" limitation argued.

In response to C) the Examiner points out that although the applicant argues that the image presentation parameters are session information, they are written as separate entities in the claims. Thus they are given their broadest reasonable interpretation. Therefore Lee in view of Holtz still meets the scope of the limitations as currently claimed.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2155

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asad M. Nawaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-3988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AMN

AMN


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER